## Annexes to the Scientific report

### A1 List of indicators developed and datasets provided to the ESPON Database

According to the fields of exposure the following sensitivity indicators were developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure Field</th>
<th>Sensitivity Field</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>erosion</td>
<td>% areas at risk of soil erosion</td>
<td>CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollutants in soil</td>
<td>(% pop+empl)/usable land</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share of artificial areas/soil sealing</td>
<td>% artificial area</td>
<td>CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water consumption</td>
<td>% inland water</td>
<td>ESPON on CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollutants in ground/surface water</td>
<td>(% pop+empl)/usable land</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollutants in air</td>
<td>concentration of PM10</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emissions of CO₂</td>
<td>((vehicles per 1000 inhab)+(dens pop))/2</td>
<td>EUROSTAT+ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy rain/flood hazard/occurrence of landslides</td>
<td>risk of flood hazard</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biodiversity</td>
<td>areas in Natura2000</td>
<td>University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation of natural heritage (landscape diversity)</td>
<td>% natural areas</td>
<td>DG Agriculture – Rural Development Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation of cultural heritage</td>
<td>n° of TCI 3-stars</td>
<td>ESPON ATTREG Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic growth (GDP/capita)</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurship</td>
<td>% self employment</td>
<td>EUROSTAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment in primary sector</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of arable area, permanent grass area, permanent crops area</td>
<td>% agricultural areas</td>
<td>ESPON on CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overnight stays</td>
<td>nights on population</td>
<td>EUROSTAT+ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disposable income in PPS per capita</td>
<td>disposable income per capita</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal income distribution</td>
<td>poverty index</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment rate</td>
<td>unemployment rate</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-migration/brain drain/&quot;shrinking regions&quot;</td>
<td>net migration balance</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of people exposed to noise</td>
<td>% population in urban areas</td>
<td>CLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident rate in transport</td>
<td>road fatalities</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident risk: industry/energy supply</td>
<td>technological &amp;/or environmental risk</td>
<td>ESPON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>healthy life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>EUROSTAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily accessibility by air</td>
<td>potential accessibility by air</td>
<td>ESPON Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily accessibility by road</td>
<td>potential accessibility by road</td>
<td>ESPON Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily accessibility by rail</td>
<td>potential accessibility by rail</td>
<td>ESPON Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewable energy</td>
<td>vulnerability to climate change</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fossil fuel consumption</td>
<td>vulnerability to climate change</td>
<td>5th Cohesion Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase of urbanization relative to population growth</td>
<td>% discontinuous urban fabric</td>
<td>ESPON on CLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**A3 List of missing indicators and data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject or Topic</th>
<th>Data missing for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% areas at risk of soil erosion</td>
<td>BE10, CH, CY, ES (30, 53-70), FR (91-94), GR (30-41), IS, LI, MT, NO, PT (20-30), SE, SK01, UKI1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corine Land Cover</td>
<td>CH, NO, LI, IS, PT (20-30), FR (91-94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 concentration</td>
<td>CH, ES70, FR (91-94), IS, LI, NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles per 1000 inhab</td>
<td>Fr (91-94), IS, PT (20-30),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Natura 2000 areas</td>
<td>CH, FR (91-94), IS, LI, NO, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% natural areas</td>
<td>CH, FR (91-94), IS, LI, NO, PT (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% self-empl on employment</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market barriers</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl primary sector – GDP per cap</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corine Land Cover</td>
<td>CH, NO, LI, IS, PT (20-30), FR (91-94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl secondary sector – GDP per cap</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl tertiary sector – GDP per cap</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total overnight stay per total population</td>
<td>ES(63-63), FR (91-94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposable income per capita</td>
<td>CH, IS, LI, NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income distribution (Poverty index)</td>
<td>CH, FR (91-94), IS, LI, NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration balance</td>
<td>CH, IS, LI, NO, UKM5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population in urban areas</td>
<td>CH, IS, LI, NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road fatalities</td>
<td>CH, IS, LI, NO, PT(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env/tech risk</td>
<td>IS, LI,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By air</td>
<td>FR (91-94), PT(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By water</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By road</td>
<td>FR (91-94), PT(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By rail</td>
<td>FR (91-94), PT(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability to climate change</td>
<td>CH, ES70, FR (91-94), IS, LI, NO, PT(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of discontinuous urban fabric</td>
<td>CH, FR (91-94), PT(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed land use</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency of government/governance</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanisms</td>
<td>duration or complexity of planning procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation rate</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societal transfers (e.g. tax added)</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transnational cooperation of regions</td>
<td>all regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A4 List of abbreviations and glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>Assessment of Regional and Territorial Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/CE</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVA</td>
<td>Gross Value Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNI</td>
<td>High negative impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPI</td>
<td>High positive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIS</td>
<td>Keep It Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD</td>
<td>Legislation, Policies and Directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTS</td>
<td>Nomenclature of Statistical Territorial Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Purchasing Power Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM</td>
<td>Regional Exposure Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REX</td>
<td>Regional Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM</td>
<td>Regional Sensitivity Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>Territorial Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>Territorial Impact Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFD</td>
<td>Water Framework Directive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **No Data**

Types of regions affected: urban, agglomerated

This map does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ESPON Monitoring Committee.
A6 Governance questionnaire

ESPON ARTS Questionnaire

The governance aspect of the territorial impact of EU directives

(Disseminated at the ESPON Seminar, 17 November 2010, Liège)

Introduction, aims and objectives

The main objective of the ESPON ARTS project is to assess the territorial sensitivity of regions to EU directives. A basic assumption underlying the project is that this sensitivity can be explained to a large extent from specific regional territorial characteristics relating to soil, air and water.

However, it is understood that territorial characteristics alone cannot completely explain the territorial effects of a directive within a region; an important additional element is the factor governance. So, a part of the ESPON ARTS project is about developing a more thorough understanding of the role of governance as an explaining factor for the territorial impact of EU directives. The basic hypothesis underlying this focus is that domestic governance structures can have either an amplifying or a mitigating effect on the potential territorial impact of EU directives.

This leads to the following question: how does the factor governance amplify or mitigate the potential territorial impact of EU directives? The answer can be found in the four policy stages that directives go to:

1. Development of the EU directive
2. Transposition/translation in national legislation
3. Implementation into existing policies or by issuing new policies
4. Actual use and jurisprudence (if any) in relation to this actual use.

In each of these four policy stages government and governance decisions play a role and can lead to unexpected territorial impact. For example:

Ad1. During the development of an EU directive member state delegations have to be sensitive for its possible effects on territory and existing domestic legislation and will very likely use knowledge about this to define negotiation boundaries.

Ad 2. Transposing a directive into domestic legislation can be done in many different ways depending on how a member state interprets the directive in the context of its own legislative system. Some member states act pragmatically and, if possible, copy-paste directives in their domestic legislation, while others add additional objectives or relate the directive to specific legislation in other policy fields.

Ad 3. The implementation of a directive depends on a variety of decisions regarding the question how the objectives of the directive can be best met given the existing domestic policy system and mechanisms. In one case existing policies already cater for meeting the directive’s objectives, in other cases existing policies need to be revised or complemented by new policies and instruments.
Ad 4. The actual use of a policy depends amongst others on the organization and functioning of the public administration, available governance capacity and resources and on the legal system within a member state or region and whether the decision made in the transposition and implementation phases allow certain degrees of flexibility.

This questionnaire aims to perform a very first preliminary analysis to filter out which domestic governance characteristics might amplify or mitigate the territorial effects of EU directives on domestic territories. Based on these characteristics the project will identify member states where territorial impact of specific directives might cause significant impact. These member states will be indicated by a Flag. The focus is on the member state level because governance characteristics are usually similar for all regions within a country. This is of course an assumption and respondents are invited to provide counter-evidence in those cases where this assumption does not seem to be valid. The outcome of this questionnaire is not only relevant for the ESPON ARTS project but may form the basis for further analysis in future ESPON projects.

In order to find out through a preliminary analysis how governance structures affect the territorial impact of EU directives across the ESPON space, the ESPON ARTS project has selected three directives for further case study analysis. The case study directives that have been selected are the following:


Selection criteria include: 1) the directive should be transposed and in force and 2) should have clear direct territorial impact.

The questionnaire itself is structured around four hypotheses on how government and governance structures may amplify or mitigate potential territorial impact of a directive. Also, by means of introduction and conclusion, two more open questions are posed. Depending on its appropriateness you can answer the questions by either referring to one of the three EU directives indicated above, or to another directive which has caused territorial impact in your country/region. The final question offers the opportunity to issue comments and suggestions as well as to provide further information on experiences related to the territorial impact of EU directives in your country. Relevant documentation to support your answers is welcomed and can be e-mailed or posted to the addresses below.
ESPON ARTS Questionnaire
Governance as an explaining factor for territorial impact

Liège, 17-18 November 2010

Respondent
Name:
E-mail:
Country:
Affiliation:

Date/Place

General questions

1. Have any of the three directives (Water Framework Directive, Air Quality and Environmental noise) mentioned above caused unexpected territorial impact in your country? What kind of (major) impact did the directive cause and was this considered negatively or positively?
2. Do you know of any other EU directive having caused unwanted or unexpected territorial impact in your member state? If so, indicate which directive or directives and what briefly characterize the impact, its main reasons and how this was dealt with.
3. Has negative impact of EU directives led to more political attention for territorial impact? And if so, how did this materialize?

Answers/comments/suggestions

Hypothesis 1 – EU directives will lead to unexpected territorial impacts when their substance and internal logic do not (closely) match existing policies and instruments at the domestic level. This may result from the fact that their transposition into domestic legislation and policies will require many additional decisions.

Questions to be answered in relation to the three directives mentioned above, or any other directive that has had clear territorial impact:
1. Do objectives of the directive run counter to domestic objectives in the same policy field?
2. Have completely new objectives and methodologies been introduced in the domestic policy system?
3. Was it easy to fit the directive in the existing legislative and policy system? (For example, the Water Framework Directive poses a fundamental institutional requirement by asking member states to install management authorities at the level of water bodies.)
4. Any other relevant observation.

Answer/comments/suggestions

**Hypothesis 2** – Unexpected territorial impact of EU directives can be avoided if the transposition and implementation of the directive is made subject to sound inter-sectoral coordination and (informal) consultation of important domestic stakeholders which are affected by the directive(s) in question (ngo’s, private sector, civic organizations and others).

Questions to be answered in relation to the three directives mentioned above or any other directive that has had clear territorial impact:
1. Which branches of government have been responsible for translating EU directives into domestic policy in the case of the directives mentioned above and was this translation the subject of inter-sectoral coordination and wider consultation?
2. Is there a tendency to relate the directive to other domestic policy objectives or add additional objectives to those of the directive?
3. Have there been any complications during the transposition and implementation and in what mitigating measures were taken?
4. Any other relevant observations?

Answers/comments/suggestions

**Hypothesis 3** – Unexpected territorial impact of EU directives can be avoided when member states start a dialogue with the European Commission.

Questions to be answered in relation to the three directives mentioned above or any other directive that has had clear territorial impact:
1. Was there any sort of dialogue with the European Commission?
2. If so: when did it occur in the policy process (expert, comitology, transposition, implementation) and what caused this dialogue?
3. What have been the results of this dialogue in terms of solutions to be applied to deal with certain unwanted situations?
4. Any other relevant observations?

Answers/comments/suggestions

**Hypothesis 4** – There is a positive correlation between the unexpected territorial impacts of EU directives and the opportunities that the judicial system offers for stakeholders to file a case to the court.

Questions to be answered in relation to the three directives mentioned above or any other directive that has had clear territorial impact:
1. Does the judicial system of your country offer the possibility for specific groups of actors/stakeholders to formally object to certain decisions on the basis of EU directives? And do stakeholders use these opportunities?
2. Did this result in some unexpected behaviour like a widening of the scope for formal complaints?
3. Is the legal interpretation of the policy different and more strict than expected?
4. Any other relevant observations?

Answers/comments/suggestions

**Any remarks, suggestions, comments that you would like to make in relation to**

1. The general assumptions underlying this project
2. This questionnaire and its hypotheses
3. Territorial impact and the factor governance in your country
4. Other?

Answer/comments/suggestions
Thank you very much for your time and effort!

On behalf of the ESPON ARTS team
Wil Zonneveld and Bas Waterhout

W.A.M.Zonneveld@tudelft.nl/B.Waterhout@tudelft.nl
+31(0)15 278 1038/+31(0)15 278 7950

Delft University of Technology
OTB Research Institute for the Built Environment
P.O. Box 5030
2600 GA Delft
The Netherlands
A7 Example for an agenda of a TIA workshop

9:00:  **Step 1: Setting the frame: The conceptual model.**
Result: a systemic picture showing the conceptual model of the directive according to its intervention logic and the potential effects of a directive

10:30  Coffee break

11:00  **Step 2: Considering different types of regions – the Regional Exposure Matrix**
**Step 3. Filling in the Directive/Exposure Matrix**
Result: The translation of the conceptual model into the directive exposure matrix, maybe for different types of regions/types of effects (“branches”)

12:00  **Step 4. Calculating the TIM and plausibility checks** + selection of relevant indicators for mapping
Result: a “stable” result of the territorial impact of a directive

12:30  Lunch break +
**Step 5. Mapping the Territorial impact** (for the host)
Result: maps of the territorial impact for the relevant indicators

13:30  **Step 6: Discussion on policy implications**
Result: minutes

14:30  End of the meeting
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